



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,582	07/09/2003	Eric Raffaele	B-4504DIV 621038-6	1312

7590 08/04/2008  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
----------

GORTAYO, DANGELINO N

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2168

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/04/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/616,582	<b>Applicant(s)</b> RAFFAELE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> DANGELINO N. GORTAYO	<b>Art Unit</b> 2168	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 12 and 16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3, 12, and 16 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

1. In the amendment filed on 5/5/2008, claims 13 and 15 have been cancelled. The currently pending claims considered below are Claims 1-3, 12, and 16.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (US Patent 7,206,844 B2) in view of Kraenzel et al. (US Patent 6,854,016 B1)

**As per claim 1**, Gupta teaches “A process for executing a downloadable service with specific access rights to at least one profile file in a user's computer, said computer comprising a web browser communication to the Internet or intranet via a first communication port and socket,” (see Abstract, column 5 lines 35-46, column 5 line 56 – column 6 line 27)

said process comprising: arranging a confined run time environment (column 10 line 66 – column 11 line 11, column 13 lines 15-25, lines 34-53, column 17 lines 41-60, wherein the client executes application software by sending requests to the webtop server and executing proxy services) which is assigned a second communication port

Art Unit: 2168

and socket (Figure 3 reference 320, Figure 4A and 4B reference 408, 418, 428, column 6 lines 48-67, column 7 lines 1-8, column 10 lines 32-53, column 10 line 66 – column 11 line 28, column 17 line 41 – column 18 line 13, wherein a webtop server can establish proxy services to satisfy a sandbox security scheme, the proxy service forwards service requests and responses) and provided with restricted access to at least one profile file; (column 7 lines 16-28, column 12 line 45 – column 13 line 32, column 20 lines 19-29, wherein a client profile is stored in a local webtop server connected to a client that is accessed by the webtop server, the profile determining accessible services)

downloading said service through said second communication port so that it is received by said confined run time environment; (column 6 lines 11-27, column 10 lines 32-53, column 19 lines 24-57, wherein applets and application software is received by a webtop server)

and executing said service within said confined run time environment whereby said service is given restricted access to said at least one profile file. (column 10 line 66 – column 11 line 11, column 13 lines 34-54, column 16 lines 9-19, column 17 lines 61 – 14, wherein a webtop server installs application software based on the client executing application software)

Gupta does not teach profile file that is located on the user's computer;

Kraenzel teaches profile file that is located on the user's computer; (column 12 line 66 – column 13 line 35, column 18 lines 32-67, wherein a profile file resides in a client that is accessed when executing downloaded files)

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gupta's method of establishing a webtop server connected to a client to execute downloadable services based on profile information with Kraenzel's method of storing profile information on a client computer. This gives the user the benefit of making the process of transferring and executing downloaded files more secure, since client information resides on the client, and allows for customizability based on profile information on the client. The motivation for doing so would be to provide a level of security and stability when downloading code from remote sources (column 2 lines 7-19)

**As per claim 2,** Gupta teaches "said confined run time environment is an extended sandbox having restrictive access to said at least one profile file." (column 13 lines 10-25)

**As per claim 3,** Gupta teaches "the service is downloaded under the form of a set of java code containing class structures packaged within a signed archive file; the service comprising: remote Internet data, a list of requested data that are needed to personalise the service, and code to sort remote Internet data using requested accessible data." (column 13 lines 34-57, column 44-60, column 15 lines 32-53)

**As per claim 16,** Gupta teaches "A process for executing a downloadable service with specific access rights to at least one profile file in a user's computer, said computer comprising a web browser communication to the Internet or intranet via a first

Art Unit: 2168

communication port and socket,” (see Abstract, column 5 lines 35-46, column 5 line 56 – column 6 line 27)

said process comprising: arranging a confined run time environment in said user's computer, (column 10 line 66 – column 11 line 11, column 13 lines 15-25, lines 34-53, column 17 lines 41-60, wherein the client executes application software by sending requests to the webtop server and executing proxy services) said confined run time environment being assigned a second communication port and socket (Figure 3 reference 320, Figure 4A and 4B reference 408, 418, 428, column 6 lines 48-67, column 7 lines 1-8, column 10 lines 32-53, column 10 line 66 – column 11 line 28, column 17 line 41 – column 18 line 13, wherein a webtop server can establish proxy services to satisfy a sandbox security scheme, the proxy service forwards service requests and responses) and provided with restricted access to at least one profile file that is located on the user's computer; (column 7 lines 16-28, column 12 line 45 – column 13 line 32, column 20 lines 19-29, wherein a client profile is stored in a local webtop server connected to a client that is accessed by the webtop server, the profile determining accessible services)

“downloading said service through said second communication port so that it is received by said confined run time environment;” (column 6 lines 11-27, column 10 lines 32-53, column 19 lines 24-57, wherein applets and application software is received by a webtop server)

and executing said service within said confined run time environment whereby said service is given restricted access to said at least one profile file. (column 10 line 66

Art Unit: 2168

– column 11 line 11, column 13 lines 34-54, column 16 lines 9-19, column 17 lines 61 – 14, wherein a webtop server installs application software based on the client executing application software)

Gupta does not teach a profile file that is located on the user's computer;

Kraenzel teaches a profile file that is located on the user's computer; (column 12 line 66 – column 13 line 35, column 18 lines 32-67, wherein a profile file resides in a client that is accessed when executing downloaded files)

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gupta's method of establishing a webtop server connected to a client to execute downloadable services based on profile information with Kraenzel's method of storing profile information on a client computer. This gives the user the benefit of making the process of transferring and executing downloaded files more secure, since client information resides on the client, and allows for customizability based on profile information on the client. The motivation for doing so would be to provide a level of security and stability when downloading code from remote sources (column 2 lines 7-19)

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al. (US Patent 7,206,844 B2) in view of Kraenzel et al. ( US Patent 6,708,221 B1) and further in view of Tan ( US Publication 2001/0045451 A1)

**As per claim 12**, Gupta in combination with Kraenzel discloses the claimed subject matter in claim 1 above. Gupta in combination with Kraenzel does not teach “said downloadable service is an authentication service cooperating with a smart card.”

Tan teaches “said downloadable service is an authentication service cooperating with a smart card.” (Abstract, paragraph 0010, 0026, 0028, wherein the execution of downloaded service by a client is authentication using a smart card). It would have been obvious at the time of the invention for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Gupta’s and Kraenzel’s combined method of remote execution of services from a server based on profile information with Tan’s ability to authenticate a user’s identity using data in a smart card. This gives the user the benefit of portability when trying to securely access services remotely. The motivation for doing so would be to provide a more robust security system when a user utilizes the Internet to access secure data by improving management of access to web servers (paragraph 0005, 0007).

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant’s arguments, see page 4, filed 5/5/2008, with respect to the rejection of claims 1-3, 12, 13, 15, and 16 in regards to 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

a. Examiner is entitled to give claim limitations their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the specification. See MPEP 2111 [R-I]

Interpretation of Claims-Broadest Reasonable Interpretation

During patent examination, the pending claims must be 'given the broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification.' Applicant always has the opportunity to amend the claims during prosecution and broad interpretation by the examiner reduces the possibility that the claim, once issued, will be interpreted more broadly than is justified. In re Prater, 162 USPQ 541,550-51 (CCPA 1969).

b. Applicant's arguments is stated as Gupta in view of Kraenzel does not disclose "arranging a confined run time environment which is assigned a second communication port and socket".

In regards to this argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. As interpreted by the examiner, the claim language of "arranging a confined run time environment in said user's computer" is read to mean that a confined run time environment is set up and organized by actions executed in the client computer. As stated in the above rejection, Gupta, in column 10 line 66 – column 11 line 11, column 13 lines 15-25, lines 34-53, column 17 lines 41-60 teaches that the client executes application software by sending requests to the webtop server and executing proxy services. As shown in Figure 4A and 4B, the webtop server, which executes and processes the application request, is part of a network of sites containing clients, and is accessed through a client tier. As seen in the cited figures, the webtop server and client work in a partnership on one side to access application servers, and the client as cited arranges for the webtop server to

retrieve and store program software from application server, to be executed in a client (column 13 lines 34-54). Therefore, Gupta teaches arranging a confined run time environment.

Additionally, Gupta, in the above rejection, and specifically in column 7 lines 1-8 and column 17 line 41 – column 18 line 13 teaches that the application requests from a client is processed through a proxy, wherein a proxy's handle that is created by the webtop server, is utilized to specifically process a specific service. The proxy service is utilized by the system to determine forwarding and filtering of requests between the clients and webtop servers, and the application servers containing applications to be executed. The established proxy services satisfies a sandbox security scheme, the proxy service forwarding service requests and responses. As disclosed in column 10 lines 33-58, the link between a webtop server and the application server transfer data in specific channels of communications link, as determined by different protocols. Therefore, Gupta teaches assigning a second communication port and socket.

c. Applicant's arguments is stated as Gupta in view of Kraenzel does not disclose restricted access to the user's profile.

In regards to this argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gupta, in column 7 lines 16-28, column 12 line 45 – column 13 line 32, column 20 lines 19-29, teaches a client profile is stored in a local webtop server connected to a client that is accessed by the webtop server, the profile determining accessible

services. Particularly, column 12 line 45 – column 13 line 32 teaches that a login service logs in a client and creates a cookie to track the client session, the cookie created and stored in the client computer that determine if the client has access to an application or network service. This is accomplished by sent by an applet once the user identity is determined. As disclosed in column 18 lines 6-13, the credential certificate used to verify the client allows access to multiple applications and network services, provided the client can access those application and network services. The security features of the system is further disclosed in column 20 lines 19-34, wherein an applet is determined to be trusted or untrusted, and it is determined how much access an application being executed on a webtop server has to the computer resources. Therefore, Gupta in view of Kraenzel teaches restricted access to the user's profile.

d. Applicant's arguments is stated as Gupta in view of Kraenzel does not disclose "executing said service within said confined run time environment whereby said service is given restricted access to said at least one profile file"

In regards to this argument, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gupta, in column 10 line 66 – column 11 line 11, column 13 lines 34-54, column 16 lines 9-19, column 17 lines 61 – 14, teaches that a webtop server installs application software based on the request of a client executing application software. Particularly, Gupta in column 10 line 66 – column 11 line 11, teaches that the webtop server stores and caches application data that a client utilizes, the client

fetching application applets that is executed for the web service. As stated above, the client sets up a confined runtime environment in the webtop server, which is in contact with application servers containing application data. As further stated in column 13 lines 34-54, the application software that is determined to be safe in a webtop server is then downloaded to the client to be executed.

Therefore, Gupta teaches executing said service within said confined run time environment whereby said service is given restricted access to said at least one profile file.

e. Applicant's arguments is stated as Gupta in view of Kraenzel does not disclose that a profile file that is located on a user's computer, because the motivation for combining the references is based on hindsight and there is no motivation to combine the two references

In response to applicant's argument that the examiner's conclusion of obviousness is based upon improper hindsight reasoning, it must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, motivation can be found in the prior art of Kraenzel, column 2 lines 7-19, wherein permission and authorization is utilized for code and applets downloaded online, as the user profile found in the clients of Kraenzel is applied to the applet distribution system of Gupta. As further stated in Gupta, column 4 lines 8-21, there is a need to ensure that code downloaded from another source does not corrupt the client, and security measures are needed.

### ***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2168

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DANGELINO N. GORTAYO whose telephone number is (571)272-7204. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tim T. Vo can be reached on (571)272-3642. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dangelino N Gortayo/  
Examiner, Art Unit 2168

Dangelino N. Gortayo  
Examiner

/Tim T. Vo/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2168

Tim T. Vo  
SPE

